REMARKS

In the Decision mailed February 5, 2008, the BPAI set forth a new ground of rejection in rejecting claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. §101. Responsive thereto, Applicant has elected to reopen prosecution pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §41.50(b).

Applicant appreciates the allowability of claims 1-6, 8-13, 15, 16 and 30. This amendment is intended to place the application in condition for allowance.

Applicant has amended claims 17, 19-23, and 31. Each of claims 17, 19-23, and 31 is now directed to a computer process executed by a computer which, when executed by at least one processor, causes the at least one processor to perform a series of process steps. Applicant believes that each of claims 17, 19-23, and 31, as now amended, is directed to statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Applicant has also amended claim 17 to further clarify what is being called for therein. As amended, claim 17 calls for, in part, a computer process executed by a computer which, when executed by at least one processor, causes the at least one processor to   receive a selection of a usage period, receive a selection of an inactive option for enablement from the GUI, transmit an electronic request for activation of the inactive option, the electronic request including the device identified, the usage period, and the inactive option for enablement, cause a remote centralized processing station to generate a code configured to enable the selected inactive option after successful processing of the electronic request, and transmit the code to the device having the inactive option over a second communication interface different from the first communication interface.

Applicant believes that claim 17, as amended, is in condition for allowance. As set forth above, claim 17 now calls for a computer process and is directed to statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101. Furthermore, that which is called for in claim 17 is patentably distinct over Moeller for reasons previously indicated by the Examiner with respect to allowed claims 1-6, 8-13, and 15-16. Claim 17, and the claims dependent therefrom, are thus in condition for allowance.

Applicant has also elected to amend claim 24 to incorporate the subject matter of claim 26. As amended, claim 24 calls for, in part, a GUI to request activation of an inactive software program resident in memory of a medical imaging scanner remotely located from a centralized processing center, the GUI including a period-of-use selector thereon. In previously rejecting the subject matter of claim 26, the Examiner stated that "Moeller teaches the method further comprising a period-of-use selector wherein the period-of-use selector includes a dropdown menu configured to display, in response to a user push-button instruction, a usage period including a trial period usage, a limited-use period usage, a pay-per-use period usage, and an indefinite period usage [Figure 2, column 4, lines 34-40, 63-67 and column 5, lines 11-19]." *Final Office Action*, April 6, 2006, p. 5. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant believes that Moeller fails to teach that which is called for in claim 24. That is, Moeller fails to teach a period-of-use selector, but instead, merely discloses that a user is able to use enabled features "for a desired period of time." *Moeller*, Col. 5, ln. 13. More specifically, Moeller discloses that, when the user no longer desires to use the selected features, the user calls the scanner company to disable the previously selected features. *Moeller*, Col. 5, lns. 20-23. As the user is required to call to cancel enabled features, it is clear that the system of Moeller does not include a period-of-use selector that allows a user to select a specified period of enablement at the time when requesting features to be activated. As such, Moeller fails to teach that which is called for in claim 24.

In addition to the above amendments and Remarks, claim 26 has been canceled and claim 27 has been amended to reflect its chain of dependency.

Therefore, in light of at least the foregoing, Applicant respectfully believes that the present application is in condition for allowance. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests timely issuance of a Notice of Allowance for claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-17, 19-25, and 27-31.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's consideration of these Amendments and Remarks and cordially invites the Examiner to call the undersigned, should the Examiner consider any matters unresolved.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kevin R. Rosin/

Kevin R. Rosin
Registration No. 55,584
Phone 262-268-8100 ext. 15
krr@zpspatents.com

Dated: April 7, 2008
Attorney Docket No.: GEMS8081.081

P.O. ADDRESS:
Ziolkowski Patent Solutions Group, SC
136 South Wisconsin Street
Port Washington, WI 53074
262-268-8100

General Authorization and Extension of Time

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-2402. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by credit card authorization being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 50-2402. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extensions under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 50-2402. Please consider this a general authorization to charge any fee that is due in this case, if not otherwise timely paid, to Deposit Account No. 50-2402.

/Timothy J. Ziolkowski/

_____

Timothy J. Ziolkowski
Registration No. 38,368
Direct Dial 262-268-8181
tjz@zpspatents.com

Dated: April 7, 2008
Attorney Docket No.: GEMS8081.081

P.O. ADDRESS:
Ziolkowski Patent Solutions Group, SC
136 South Wisconsin Street
Port Washington, WI 53074
262-268-8100